

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC92000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

DRAWINGS

FIG. 5 has been amended to remove the objections of the Examiner and correct another minor error. In FIG. 5, reference numerals 90 and 92 have been replaced by reference numerals 94 and 96 respectively as these reference numerals were used to designate other elements in FIG. 4. The description in the specification has been amended accordingly.

The specification has been amended to remove the objections of the Examiner to reference numerals 160, 170, 172 of FIG. 6, such that, the description includes references to the reference numerals 160, 170, and 172 of FIG. 6.

SPECIFICATION

The specification has been corrected as requested by the Examiner.

Paragraph on page 7, line 16 has been amended to replace incorrect reference numerals with correct reference numerals that correspond to the drawings.

Paragraph on page 9, line 16 has been amended to include reference to reference numeral 160 that corresponds to the drawings.

Paragraph on page 9, line 27 has been amended to include references to references numerals 170 and 172 that correspond to the drawings.

Paragraph on page 6, line 8 has been amended to replace incorrect reference numeral 82 with the correct reference numeral 84 that correspond to the drawings.

Paragraph on page 4, line 25 has been amended to capitalize trademarks. The generic terminology corresponding to the trademarks is referred to in page 4, lines 26-27.

Paragraph on page 12, line 6 has been amended to capitalize trademarks and indicate the owner of the MICROSOFT WORD trademark.

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC920000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

CLAIMS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-36. Claims 1-9, 11-21, 23-33, 35-36 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McRae (US 4,888,730). Claims 10, 22, and 34 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Walsh (US 5,873,660).

In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, 25 and added three new dependent claims. Applicants submit that claims 1-39 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Amended Independent Claims 1, 13, 25

Claims 1, 13, and 25 are a method, system, and program that are computer implementations for editing text in a computer text editor program, comprising:

- determining terms repeated in a section of text;
- determining terms associated with the repeated terms that may be used as substitute terms for the repeated terms, wherein the substitute terms are capable of being modified via user inputs;
- selecting one instance of one repeated term in the text;
- receiving user selection of one associated term for the selected instance of the repeated term; and
- replacing the selected associated term for the selected instance of the repeated term in response to the user selection.

Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 13, 25 to include the limitations that the substitute terms are capable of being modified via user inputs. The requirements for the added claims limitations may be found in at least in pages 4-11; page 6: lines 8-28; page 7: lines 1-26; and figures 1-6 of the original application.

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC920000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

The cited McRae (col. 2, lines 38-43; col. 2: lines 49-60; col. 3: lines 13-15; col. 3: lines 3-7) discusses the replacement of repeated terms that are frequently overused in a section of text. The cited McRae discusses that a thesaurus list stored in ROM (Read Only Memory) is used to determine substitute terms that are associated with the frequently overused terms in the section of text. The cited McRae further discusses that the substitute terms in the thesaurus list are used to replace the overused terms in the section of text.

Nowhere does the cited McRae teach or disclose the claim requirements that the substitute terms are capable of being modified by user inputs. The cited McRae discusses that the section of text is stored is editable, i.e., the repeated terms in the section of text can be replaced. However, nowhere does the cited McRae teach or disclose the claim requirements that the substitute terms are capable of being modified by user inputs. In fact, the cited McRae teaches away from the claim requirements because in McRae (col. 8 lines 32-33) the thesaurus list is stored in ROM. A ROM is read only memory and cannot be modified by user inputs. Therefore, the claim requirement of the substitute terms that are capable of being modified by user inputs are not taught or disclosed by the cited McRae.

For the above reasons, claims 1, 13, and 25 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 2-12, 14-24 and 26-36

The Examiner has also rejected pending claims 2-12, 14-24 and 26-36 that depend on the pending independent claims 1, 13, and 25 respectively that the applicants submit as patentable. Accordingly claims 2-12, 14-24 and 26-36 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 6, 18, 30

Claim 6 depends on claim 1, and further comprises:

receiving user input of a term to associate with a subject term; and

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC920000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

storing the association of the inputted term and the subject term, wherein the inputted term is one of the determined associated terms when the subject term is a subsequently determined repeated term.

The cited McRae (col. 8, lines 38-45, and 64-66) discusses using a thesaurus program to substitute an overused word. McRay (col. 8: lines 32-33) discusses that the thesaurus list associated with the thesaurus program is stored in ROM stores the subject terms. Since the thesaurus list is stored in read only memory (ROM), the thesaurus list discussed in the cited McRay cannot be modified and new associations with the subject term cannot be stored based on user inputs of a term. Therefore, the cited McRae does not teach or disclose the claims limitations of receiving user input of a term to associate with a subject term and storing the association of the inputted term and the subject term.

For the above reasons, claims 6, 18, 30 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 7, 19, 31

Claim 7 depends on claim 6 and further comprises:

receiving user input of a term to remove as an associated term with the subject term, wherein the removed term is not one of the determined associated terms when the subject term is a subsequently determined repeated term.

The cited McRae (col. 15: lines 61-65) discusses using a thesaurus program to substitute an overused word. McRay (col. 8: lines 32-33) discusses that the thesaurus list associated with the thesaurus program is stored in ROM stores the subject terms. Since the thesaurus list is stored in read only memory (ROM), the thesaurus list discussed in the cited McRay cannot be modified and new associations with the subject term cannot be stored based on user inputs of a term. Therefore, the cited McRae does not teach or disclose the claims limitations of receiving user input of a term to remove an associated term with the subject term.

For the above reasons, claims 7, 19, 31 are patentable over the cited art.

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC920000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

Claims 8, 20, 32

Claim 8 depends on claim 1, and further comprises:

maintaining different groups of associated terms; wherein each group comprises different sets of associated terms; and

determining a selected group of associated terms, wherein determining the terms associated with the selected repeated term further comprises determining terms in the selected group associated with the selected repeated term, wherein different groups are capable of providing different associated terms for the selected repeated term.

The cited McRay (col 2, lines 9-12) discusses a succession of synonyms, i.e., one or more synonyms. In the cited McRay a plurality of synonyms are kept for a word in a thesaurus. Nowhere does the cited McRay teach or disclose the claim requirement that the different groups are capable of providing different associated terms for the selected repeated term. In contrast, in the cited McRay the selection of a repeated patterns leads to a selection of a synonym from the thesaurus.

For the above reasons, claims 8, 20, and 32 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 9, 21, 33

Claim 9 depends on claim 8, and further comprises:

receiving user input indicating to modify the groups of associated terms, wherein the user input is capable of indicating to add additional associated terms to the groups, remove associated terms from the groups, remove an entire group and add a new group of associated terms; and

performing the user received modification operation on the groups to modify the groups of associated terms.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 based on the same reasons provided for rejecting claims 7 and 8. As indicated in response to the rejections of claims 7 and 8, the cited McRae (col. 15: lines 61-65) discusses using a thesaurus program to substitute an overused word. McRay (col. 8: lines 32-33) discusses that the thesaurus list associated with the thesaurus program is

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC920000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

stored in ROM and stores the subject terms. Since the thesaurus list is stored in read only memory (ROM), the thesaurus list discussed in the cited McRay cannot be modified and therefore McRay does not teach or disclose the claims limitations of performing the user received modification operation on the groups to modify the groups of associated terms.

For the above reasons, claims 9, 21, and 33 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 12, 24, 36

Claim 12 depends on claim 1, wherein the repeated terms are capable of including terms that are different words that include a same word stem.

The term root word in the cited McRay (col. 4, lines 19-20) is different from word stem as discussed in the application in page 5, lines 13-16. Therefore, the cited McRay does not teach or disclose the claims limitations that the repeated terms are capable of including terms that are different words that include a same word stem.

For the above reasons, claims 12, 24, 36 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 10, 22, 34

Claim 10 depends on claim 8, wherein the groups of associated terms comprise different literary categories.

Claims 10, 22, and 34 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Walsh (US 5,873,660). Applicants have already argued for the patentability of claim 8 on which claim 10 depends and therefore claim 10 is patentable. Additional reasons for the patentability of claim 10 are provided below.

The Examiner combines the cited Walsh's (col. 3, lines 15-21, col. 7: lines 5-11) categorized thesauri lists with the cited McRae's overused word substitutions to and mentions that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claim limitations. However, nowhere does the cited Walsh or the cited McRae teach or suggest that the

Amdt. dated February 23, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/21/03

Serial No. 09/636,655
Docket No. ROC920000077US1
Firm No. 0021.0011

groups of associated terms comprise different literary categories as required by the claims. In fact, nowhere does the cited Walsh or the cited McRae even mention literary categories as required by the claims. The categorized thesauri list of the cited Walsh are not literary categories. The replacement of words in the cited McRae are not literary categories. Therefore, neither the cited Walsh nor the cited McRae teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, the cited Walsh and the cited McRae does not teach or suggest the claim limitations either alone or in combination.

For the above reasons, claims 10, 22, 34 are patentable over the cited art.

New dependent claims 37-39

The requirements of new dependent claims 37-39 may be found in at least pages 4-11; page 6: lines 17-19; page 6, lines 26-28; and page 7: lines 19-26 of the original application.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-39 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have added three new claims and indicated appropriate fees. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: February 23, 2004

By: Rabindranath Dutta

Rabindranath Dutta
Registration No. 51,010

Please direct all correspondences to:

Rabindranath Dutta
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-557-2292
Fax: 310-556-7984